

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9

10

Willie Roberts and Carla Sutton,  
Plaintiffs,

No. 1:21-cv-00725-KJM-CDB

ORDER

11

v.

12

County of Kern, et al.,

13

Defendants.

14

15

16

In a previous order, this court set a final pretrial conference and deadlines for filing motions in limine. *See Order* (Mar. 5, 2025), ECF No. 41. The court directed the parties to “meet and confer and file a joint pretrial statement no less than 14 days prior to the final pretrial conference,” set in the same order for April 17, 2025. *See id.* at 10. The court also instructed that “[a]ll motions in limine must be filed in conjunction with the joint pretrial statement.” *Id.*

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiffs filed motions in limine in conjunction with the parties’ joint pretrial statement. *See Pls.’ Mot. in Limine*, ECF No. 45; *see also* Joint Pretrial Statement, ECF No. 44. Defendants did not. They now request “clarification” of the court’s previous order; they interpreted that order “to mean that the parties must include their intended motions in limine in their joint pretrial statement.” Mot. Clarification, ECF No. 46. By their reading, the filing dates for any motions in limine would be set “according to the briefing schedule determined at the final pretrial conference on April 17, 2025.” *Id.*

1           The court's previous order is clear: motions in limine were to be "filed," not identified or  
2 listed, "in conjunction with the joint pretrial statement." The motion for clarification (ECF  
3 No. 46) is **denied**.

4           IT IS SO ORDERED.

5           DATED: April 10, 2025.  
6  
7

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE